

Summer 7-19-1967

University Council Meeting, July 19, 1967

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "University Council Meeting, July 19, 1967" (1967). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1026.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1026>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

JULY 19, 1967

Table of Contents

	Page
1. Academic Standards Committee Report	8
2. Committee in Regard to AAUP Resolution Report	6
3. Communications	10
a. Announcement of Committee on Selection of Dean of the College of Business	11
b. Appointment of member to Joint Faculty Policy Committee	11
c. Letter from Lyle M. Young - Faculty Status Committee	10
d. Letter from President Bone - 1967 Blue Book	10
e. Letter from Ralph Smith - Faculty Advisory and Hearing Committee Panel	11
f. Memorandum Concerning Recreation Problems from Dean Bond ..	12
g. Report Concerning the University Code	10
h. Resolution from George Drew	11
4. Discussion of Problems Relating to Selection of Department Heads ..	8
5. Elections Committee Report - Members for Committee on Selection of Dean of College of Business	9
6. Election of Member to Student Code Enforcement and Review Board ..	9
7. Motion to Schedule University Council Meeting on August 9, 1967	12
8. Proposals for Master's Degree Programs in Economics, Physics, Political Science, and Sociology	6
9. Subcommittee on General Education Report	1 & 13
10. Welcome to Dr. Samuel E. Braden	1

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL
(Not approved by the Council)

DATE: July 19, 1967

MEMBERS PRESENT

1. Richard Bond	7. Charles Hicklin	13. Carroll Peterson
2. George Drew	8. Richard Hulet	14. Mary Rozum
3. John Ferrell	9. Eric Johnson	15. Stanley Shuman
4. Fred Fuess	10. Fred Kagy	16. Eunice Speer
5. Dean Hage	11. Walter Kohn	17. David Sweet
6. Warren Harden	12. Warren Perry	

MEMBERS ABSENT

1. Robert Bone
2. Charles Gray
3. Barbara Hall

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the University Council was called to order by the chairman, Mr. Shuman, at 7:30 p. m. in the third floor lounge of the University Union.

WELCOME TO DR. BRADEN

Mr. Shuman welcomed Dr. Samuel E. Braden, the newly-elected President of Illinois State University, to the meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Harden moved that the minutes of the meeting of June 21, 1967, be approved as distributed to the faculty. Mr. Hage seconded the motion.

Mr. Kohn raised a question concerning Dean Hulet's motion on page two. He pointed out that it was not intended to be related to the motion that he himself had previously made and should have read as follows:

Dean Hulet moved that the Council recommend to the President the acceptance of the revised Parking Board report except that the recommendation concerning the prohibiting of freshmen to bring cars to the campus be forwarded without recommendation.

Two typographical errors were noted. On page eight under Resignation of David Sweet, Mr. Sweet's last name was omitted. On page 11 under Revision in Code Proposed by Parking Board, vehicle registration fees for all faculty, staff, on-campus students, and full-time commuter students should have read "\$25.00 for the school year Sept. 10 - Sept. 10 and \$10.00 for each additional vehicle."

The motion to approve the minutes was carried by a voice vote.

REPORT BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION

Dean Hermanowicz began the report by reviewing the steps taken by the Subcommittee on General Education since that group met with the University Council on November 16, 1966, and at which time the Council approved a series of procedures to be employed by the Subcommittee for finalizing a set of recommendations in revising the General Education program

at the University. Secondly, he described certain parts of the proposed revision of the General Education program. He concluded his remarks by reviewing the two major concerns expressed by the Subcommittee in respect to the proposed program. A summary of the report given by Dean Hermanowicz as well as a set of objections offered by Mr. Bernard McCarney to the proposed revision of General Education and his alternative proposal are attached to the minutes.

Mr. Shuman asked the secretary to read a letter from Mr. Gimmestad, Head of the Department of English, which was dated July 13, 1967, and read as follows:

At our meeting on June 27, 1967, the Department of English passed the following motion:

The English Department suggests that for the reasons listed below the University Council at this time should not approve any revision of the General Education requirements.

- 1) A new president will be inaugurated in September, and major curriculum revisions may be inopportune right at the time of such a change.
- 2) The Colleges of the University have been in existence for only one year and the implications of the division into colleges are not yet clear.
- 3) Before major curriculum changes are made the new Deans of the Colleges and the new College Councils should be firmly established in their positions.
- 4) Dean Bond has been in office for only one year and that is too short a time for him to prepare to participate in curriculum planning to the extent to be expected from the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

In general, the changes through which the University is now going make this a most inopportune time for arriving at a final decision on a matter so vital as the revision of General Education requirements.

We request that changes in the General Education program not be made at this time.

It was then suggested by the chairman of the University Council that members of the audience be given an opportunity to express reactions to the proposed revision of General Education. He specified that only one person from each department might speak for a period of no more than five minutes.

Mr. Champagne, Head of the History Department, spoke in favor of the modification of Group III, C which reads that a minimum of three semester hours be required in non-U. S. History. His reason was essentially two-fold. He was of the opinion that no college graduate should graduate without some knowledge of the historical trends of peoples and socialistic cultures outside his own. In addition, he supported his position by the results of a survey conducted this spring, in which only about 25% of the students surveyed had taken world history in high school. He stated that without such a modification as stated previously that there would be a large percentage of students who would not have taken any history except U. S. History.

Mr. Vetter of the English Department was of the opinion that it would be impossible to bring about the level of expository writing needed by college students with a requirement of just three hours of composition. He felt that the Humanities had been reduced in terms of hours in favor of the sciences and that the reduction had gone too far. He favored a General Education program that was not frozen but could be appraised at any time.

Mr. Charles White, Head of the Speech Department, suggested that in Group III, B, the word "drama" be changed to "theater" so as to be in keeping with art and music. He suggested that the University Council ask what is meant by the term "Fine Arts."

Mr. Shuman outlined possible lines of action that the University Council might take in terms of the proposed revision of General Education.

Mr. Hicklin moved that the General Education proposal be forwarded intact to the Council on General Education for additions or changes necessary to conform to the spirit of the Master Plan in that articulation procedures be provided to enable junior college students to transfer to Illinois State University without penalty. The General Education Council should then report back to the University Council as soon as practical. Mr. Drew seconded the motion.

Mr. Fuess raised the question as to whether Illinois State University should fit its program to the junior colleges or vice versa. During the course of the discussion, Mr. Harden expressed the opinion that we should take the leadership rather than following the junior colleges. Mr. Hicklin suggested that the University send out its General Education requirements to the junior colleges so that they would be aware of them. Dean Hermanowicz indicated that the problem had been discussed by the Subcommittee although that group had not been charged with this matter. Dean Bond felt that neither the University nor the junior colleges should tailor its program to fit the other's.

Mr. Kohn moved to amend Mr. Hicklin's motion to read: "It is moved that the General Education proposal be forwarded intact to the Council on General Education." Miss Speer seconded the motion. Mr. Kohn expressed the opinion that the subject of General Education needed more thought and greater familiarity by the faculty. He suggested that the topic of General Education would be a good one for the annual University Council retreat.

Mr. Sweet spoke in favor of the proposed revision of General Education by stating that there was more chance for adjustment to individual needs and that the grouping of subjects was more adequate than in the past. He felt that after four years of study that it would be unfortunate for the Council to do nothing with the proposal.

Dean Hermanowicz cited that relatively few faculty members attended the two open meetings in 1964 and that there was just a 30% return on the questionnaires sent out in September, 1963. He was of the opinion that a termination point must be set in regard to faculty discussion of the matter of General Education. He predicted that the Council on General Education would face the same pressures and receive the same comments as the Subcommittee.

Mr. Peterson commented that because the matter had been studied for four years, that it wasn't necessary to accept the proposal on that basis alone. He felt that the departments did not have time to respond to the final proposal and that the Council of General Education was the appropriate body to be concerned with the matter.

President-elect Braden stated that he felt that this was a faculty matter and that he would participate as a member of the faculty in any future discussions. He expressed agreement with Mr. Sweet's position on the matter and commented that he saw no need to delay action until new members of the faculty were present.

Mr. Johnson pointed out that junior colleges have to transfer their students to us and therefore we should communicate with some segment of the junior colleges. He stated that we all operate under the Board of Higher Education and that Illinois State University will be in a better position if we indicate an interest in this matter in respect to the junior colleges.

Dean Hermanowicz reported that if the proposed revision of General Education is accepted that it would go into effect a year from next September and would not be retroactive.

Mr. Sweet questioned why it takes 18 months to get a change in the University catalog. He suggested that a printed amendment be used in case of changes.

Mr. Hicklin called for the previous question on Mr. Kohn's amendment. Mr. Harden seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

Voting "Yes"

1. Richard Bond	6. Warren Harden	11. Walter Kohn	16. Eunice Speer
2. George Drew	7. Charles Hicklin	12. Warren Perry	17. David Sweet
3. John Ferrell	8. Richard Hulet	13. Carroll Peterson	
4. Fred Fuess	9. Eric Johnson	14. Mary Rozum	
5. Dean Hage	10. Fred Kagy	15. Stanley Shuman	

The motion carried.

The balloting on Mr. Kohn's amendment was as follows:

Voting "Yes"

Voting "No"

1. Walter Kohn	1. Richard Bond	6. Warren Harden	11. Warren Perry
2. Carroll Peterson	2. George Drew	7. Charles Hicklin	12. Mary Rozum
3. Eunice Speer	3. John Ferrell	8. Richard Hulet	13. Stanley Shuman
	4. Fred Fuess	9. Eric Johnson	14. David Sweet
	5. Dean Hage	10. Fred Kagy	

The motion failed.

Mr. Sweet moved a substitute motion that the University Council recommend the adoption of the General Education proposal presented by the Curriculum Committee with the changes found on pages 6 (16) and 7 (16)* and with the recommendation that the Council on General Education immediately begin efforts to relate our program of General Education to the needs of the junior colleges of the state by making contact with representatives of these schools. Mr. Kagy seconded the motion.

Mr. Fuess moved to strike the words "with the changes found on pages 6 (16) and 7 (16)*." Mr. Hage seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

Voting "Yes"

Voting "No"

1. Fred Fuess	1. Richard Bond	6. Richard Hulet	11. Mary Rozum
2. Dean Hage	2. George Drew	7. Eric Johnson	12. Stanley Shuman
3. Warren Perry	3. John Ferrell	8. Fred Kagy	13. David Sweet
4. Eunice Speer	4. Warren Harden	9. Walter Kohn	
	5. Charles Hicklin	10. Carroll Peterson	

The motion failed.

* Page number referring to material in minutes of July 19, 1967.

Dean Bond moved to add to Mr. Sweet's motion the sentence on page 6 (16)* under Group VI Electives the following changes as indicated in quotation marks. A student may elect "five" semester hours of study "in any designated General Education courses" in any fields outside of his major or minor area of study. Mr. Sweet seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

<u>Voting "Yes"</u>			<u>Voting "No"</u>
1. Richard Bond	6. Richard Hulet	11. Carroll Peterson	1. John Ferrell
2. George Drew	7. Eric Johnson	12. Mary Rozum	2. Fred Fuess
3. Dean Hage	8. Fred Kagy	13. Stanley Shuman	
4. Warren Harden	9. Walter Kohn	14. Eunice Speer	
5. Charles Hicklin	10. Warren Perry	15. David Sweet	

The motion carried.

Dean Bond moved to add to Mr. Sweet's motion that the Council on General Education be asked to review the entire General Education program within the next two years. Mr. Kohn seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

<u>Voting "Yes"</u>			
1. Richard Bond	6. Warren Harden	11. Walter Kohn	16. Eunice Speer
2. George Drew	7. Charles Hicklin	12. Warren Perry	17. David Sweet
3. John Ferrell	8. Richard Hulet	13. Carroll Peterson	
4. Fred Fuess	9. Eric Johnson	14. Mary Rozum	
5. Dean Hage	10. Fred Kagy	15. Stanley Shuman	

The motion carried.

Mr. Peterson moved to amend the motion to delete the five hours from Group VI and restore them to Group III Humanities. Mr. Kohn seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

<u>Voting "Yes"</u>	<u>Voting "No"</u>	<u>Present</u>
1. Richard Bond	1. George Drew	1. Stanley Shuman
2. John Ferrell	2. Fred Fuess	
3. Walter Kohn	3. Dean Hage	
4. Carroll Peterson	4. Warren Harden	
	5. Charles Hicklin	
	6. Richard Hulet	
	7. Eric Johnson	
	8. Fred Kagy	
	9. Warren Perry	
	10. Mary Rozum	
	11. Eunice Speer	
	12. David Sweet	

The motion was defeated.

The vote on Mr. Sweet's substitute motion was as follows:

* Page number referring to material in minutes of July 19, 1967.

Voting "Yes"

- | | |
|--------------------|------------------|
| 1. Richard Bond | 7. Eric Johnson |
| 2. George Drew | 8. Fred Kagy |
| 3. Fred Fuess | 9. Warren Perry |
| 4. Dean Hage | 10. Mary Rozum |
| 5. Charles Hicklin | 11. Eunice Speer |
| 6. Richard Hulet | 12. David Sweet |

Voting "No"

1. John Ferrell
2. Warren Harden
3. Walter Kohn
4. Carroll Peterson

Present

1. Stanley Shuman

The motion carried.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE IN REGARD TO AAUP RESOLUTION

Mr. Ferrell reported for his committee.

Mr. Hicklin moved that the Council adopt the statement as presented by Mr. Ferrell.
Mr. Drew seconded the motion.

Mr. Shuman reported that he had asked Mr. Harden and Mr. Sweet to attend a hearing held in the Circuit Court on Wednesday morning. Mr. Sweet gave a summary of the proceedings.

The Council agreed to Mr. Shuman's suggestion which was to replace the word "endorse" with the word "reaffirm" in the statement presented by the committee.

The revised statement is as follows:

"It is the committee's recommendation that the University Council reaffirm the principle that communications requested in confidence in the process of evaluation will be held in confidence. The committee further recommends that the University Council forward to the Joint Faculty Policy Committee their concern for this principle and encourage its possible implementation by the Board of Regents."

The voting was as follows:

Voting "Yes"

- | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Richard Bond | 5. Dean Hage | 9. Eric Johnson | 13. Carroll Peterson |
| 2. George Drew | 6. Warren Harden | 10. Fred Kagy | 14. Mary Rozum |
| 3. John Ferrell | 7. Charles Hicklin | 11. Walter Kohn | 15. Stanley Shuman |
| 4. Fred Fuess | 8. Richard Hulet | 12. Warren Perry | 16. David Sweet |

The motion carried.

PROPOSALS FOR MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAMS IN ECONOMICS, PHYSICS, POLITICAL SCIENCE, AND SOCIOLOGY

Dean Helgeson presented the four programs for consideration. In answer to a question concerning the listing of a \$5,000 calculator on two of the programs, Mr. Johnson indicated that these are not budget commitments and so are not significant from that standpoint.

Mr. Peterson moved that the Council approve the proposal for a Master's degree in Economics as presented by the Graduate Council. Mr. Hicklin seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

Voting "Yes"

- | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 1. Richard Bond | 6. Warren Harden | 11. Walter Kohn | 16. Eunice Speer |
| 2. George Drew | 7. Charles Hicklin | 12. Warren Perry | 17. David Sweet |
| 3. John Ferrell | 8. Richard Hulet | 13. Carroll Peterson | |
| 4. Fred Fuess | 9. Eric Johnson | 14. Mary Rozum | |
| 5. Dean Hage | 10. Fred Kagy | 15. Stanley Shuman | |

The motion carried.

Mr. Kohn moved that the Council approve the proposal for a Master's degree in Physics. Mr. Sweet seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

Voting "Yes"

- | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 1. Richard Bond | 6. Warren Harden | 11. Walter Kohn | 16. Eunice Speer |
| 2. George Drew | 7. Charles Hicklin | 12. Warren Perry | 17. David Sweet |
| 3. John Ferrell | 8. Richard Hulet | 13. Carroll Peterson | |
| 4. Fred Fuess | 9. Eric Johnson | 14. Mary Rozum | |
| 5. Dean Hage | 10. Fred Kagy | 15. Stanley Shuman | |

The motion carried.

Mr. Sweet moved that the Council approve the proposal for a Master's degree in Political Science as presented by the Graduate Council. Mr. Ferrell seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

Voting "Yes"

- | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 1. Richard Bond | 6. Warren Harden | 11. Walter Kohn | 16. Eunice Speer |
| 2. George Drew | 7. Charles Hicklin | 12. Warren Perry | 17. David Sweet |
| 3. John Ferrell | 8. Richard Hulet | 13. Carroll Peterson | |
| 4. Fred Fuess | 9. Eric Johnson | 14. Mary Rozum | |
| 5. Dean Hage | 10. Fred Kagy | 15. Stanley Shuman | |

The motion carried.

Mr. Kohn moved that the Council approve the proposal for a Master's degree in Sociology as presented by the Graduate Council. Mr. Harden seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

Voting "Yes"

- | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 1. Richard Bond | 6. Warren Harden | 11. Walter Kohn | 16. Eunice Speer |
| 2. George Drew | 7. Charles Hicklin | 12. Warren Perry | 17. David Sweet |
| 3. John Ferrell | 8. Richard Hulet | 13. Carroll Peterson | |
| 4. Fred Fuess | 9. Eric Johnson | 14. Mary Rozum | |
| 5. Dean Hage | 10. Fred Kagy | 15. Stanley Shuman | |

The motion carried.

REPORT BY THE ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Due to the absence of the chairman of the Academic Standards Committee, Dean Bond presented the report. He expressed the opinion that there was too much emphasis on the IBM computation which promotes the use of cumulative grades.

Mr. Peterson moved that the University Council approve the revisions of the requirements for University scholastic honors as presented by the Academic Standards Committee. Miss Speer seconded the motion.

Questions were posed in terms of the student who receives all A's and one C, the reverse of the Dean's list, and the number of probations allowed.

The voting was as follows:

Voting "Yes"

- | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 1. Richard Bond | 6. Warren Harden | 11. Walter Kohn | 16. Eunice Speer |
| 2. George Drew | 7. Charles Hicklin | 12. Warren Perry | 17. David Sweet |
| 3. John Ferrell | 8. Richard Hulet | 13. Carroll Peterson | |
| 4. Fred Fuess | 9. Eric Johnson | 14. Mary Rozum | |
| 5. Dean Hage | 10. Fred Kagy | 15. Stanley Shuman | |

The motion carried.

The committee's report is attached to the minutes.

DISCUSSION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO SELECTION OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

Mr. Shuman introduced the discussion by reviewing the fact that in 2 e of the Procedures and Policies for Selecting Department Heads "no person who serves as acting head of a department during the time that a department head is being recruited shall be eligible to become head of the department."

Dean Bond commented that in the case of the College of Business that he felt the Dean of the College of Business should have an active role in the selection of the various department heads. However, he pointed out that the departments were small which posed a problem in terms of following the accepted procedures.

Mr. Sweet was of the opinion that the Dean of the Faculty should act in accordance to the procedures in order to preserve their integrity.

Mr. Perry moved that we suspend the rules for the selection of acting department heads so that a person could become a candidate for the headship of a department in the case of the College of Business. This refers to 2 e of the Procedures and Policies for Selecting Department Heads. Mr. Hage seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

Voting "Yes"

1. Dean Hage
2. Warren Perry

Voting "No"

- | | | |
|------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Richard Bond | 6. Charles Hicklin | 11. Carroll Peterson |
| 2. George Drew | 7. Richard Hulet | 12. Mary Rozum |
| 3. John Ferrell | 8. Eric Johnson | 13. Stanley Shuman |
| 4. Fred Fuess | 9. Fred Kagy | 14. Eunice Speer |
| 5. Warren Harden | 10. Walter Kohn | 15. David Sweet |

The motion failed.

REPORT OF THE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Miss Rozum read the report of the Elections Committee which consists of Mr. Claude Bell, chairman, Mr. Robert Singer, and Mr. Charles Edwards.

- I. Selection of Faculty Members by College of Business for Committee on Selection of College Dean
 - A. Meeting with College of Business, June 27, 1967, to explain procedures of election and to set dates for primary and final election.
 - B. Primary election conducted Wednesday, June 28 to noon Thursday, June 29, 1967.
 1. 16 Ballots placed in boxes of faculty members eligible to vote.
 2. 15 Ballots were returned to ballot box, Turner Hall 210.
 3. Members with highest number of votes:
 - Department of Accounting
 - Ray Esworthy
 - Gary Fish
 - Department of Business Administration
 - James Hallam
 - *Edmund Ficek
 - *Harold Koepke
 - Department of Business Education
 - Arnold Condon
 - *Jane Irvin
 - *Warren Perry
 - *Tie vote
 - a. Dr. Lewis R. Toll, Acting Dean, College of Business, participated in meeting of Election Committee to break tie votes by lot.
 - b. Edmund Ficek and Jane Irvin were selected as the second candidate from their respective departments.
 - C. Final election conducted Friday, June 30, 1967.
 1. 16 Ballots placed in boxes of faculty members eligible to vote.
 2. 15 Ballots were returned to ballot box, Turner Hall 210.
 3. The three faculty members with the highest number of votes were:
 - Ray Esworthy
 - James Hallam
 - Arnold Condon
- These persons will serve on the Committee on Selection of College Dean for the College of Business.
- II. Recommendations of Election Committee
 - A. Due to its short term of service, the present Elections Committee does not wish to make recommended changes in election procedures at this time.

It was announced by the secretary that Mr. Earl Reitan will serve on the Faculty Advisory and Hearing Committee Panel until May 1969 in place of Mr. Elwood Egelston.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO STUDENT CODE ENFORCEMENT AND REVIEW BOARD

Mrs. Mary Packwood was elected to the Board and will serve until 1970.

Mr. Kohn expressed the need for a list of faculty members with their various committee assignments in order to avoid overusing people.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letter from Lyle M. Young

Miss Rozum read a letter from Mr. Young in which he declined the election to the Faculty Status Committee because of his previous election to the Music Department APT Committee in May, 1967.

Mr. Drew moved that we postpone action on the election of another member to serve on the Faculty Status Committee. Mr. Kagy seconded the motion. The motion carried by a voice vote.

Letter from President Bone

Mr. Shuman read a letter from President Bone in regard to bringing up-to-date the 1958 Blue Book. He indicated that a rough draft of the material had already been sent to the University Council members. He stated that funds had been set aside to print a two-year's supply of the new edition which would give the new president and a University Council committee an ample opportunity to revise the 1967 edition. President Bone suggested that the University Council, a committee of three selected by the Council, or the Executive Committee edit the final draft.

Mr. Hicklin moved that the Executive Committee be charged to select a committee to carry out the President's request. Mr. Kohn seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a voice vote.

Report concerning University Code

Mr. Kenneth Shaw presented a rough draft of the cover letter for the University Code and a set of recommended procedures for modification of the Code.

Revisions for numbers two and three of the procedures for modifying or supplementing the Code were discussed and agreed upon by the Council members.

Mr. Kohn moved that the Council accept the cover letter for the University Code and that if any members of the Council feel that any additional changes be made that they communicate with Mr. Shaw. Mr. Perry seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

Voting "Yes"

1. John Ferrell
2. Fred Fuess
3. Eric Johnson
4. Walter Kohn
5. Warren Perry

6. Carroll Peterson
7. Mary Rozum
8. Stanley Shuman
9. Eunice Speer

Voting "No"

1. Richard Bond
2. George Drew
3. Dean Hage
4. Richard Hulet
5. Fred Kagy

Present

1. Warren Harden
2. Charles Hicklin
3. David Sweet

The motion carried.

Letter from Ralph Smith - Faculty Advisory and Hearing Committee Panel

Mr. Shuman read a communication from Mr. Smith in which he reported that at a meeting of the Faculty Advisory and Hearing Committee Panel on July 12, 1967, the following people were elected for the coming year: Chairman, Ralph L. Smith, Advisory Committee, Douglas Poe, Earl Reitan, and Irwin Spector. The chairman of the Advisory Committee will be selected when Mr. Reitan returns to the campus in the fall.

Resolution from George Drew

The chairman, Mr. Shuman, read the following resolution from Mr. George Drew:

WHEREAS: The Board of Regents is contemplating major revisions in their By-Laws, and
WHEREAS: The Board of Regents expects to involve the faculty in such revisions through the Joint Faculty Policy Committee, and
WHEREAS: The members of the Joint Faculty Policy Committee from Illinois State University will be composed of four administrators, two of whom will be from the same Department, three of whom will be from the same College, and all of whom will be appointed by the University Council,
BE IT RESOLVED, THEREFORE: That the Council go on record as encouraging the members of the Joint Faculty Policy Committee to set up procedures which actively involve a broad base of Faculty from all Colleges and many Departments and from the Teaching Faculty as well as the Administration in the development of the new By-Laws of the Board of Regents.

Mr. Harden moved that the Council accept the resolution in principle and forward it to the Joint Faculty Policy Committee. Mr. Ferrell seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

Voting "Yes"

1. Richard Bond
2. George Drew
3. John Ferrell
4. Fred Fuess
5. Dean Hage
6. Warren Harden

7. Charles Hicklin
8. Richard Hulet
9. Eric Johnson
10. Fred Kagy
11. Walter Kohn
12. Warren Perry

Present

13. Carroll Peterson
14. Mary Rozum
15. Stanley Shuman
16. Eunice Speer

1. David Sweet

The motion carried.

Joint Faculty Policy Committee Members

Mr. Shuman named Mr. Hicklin to replace Mr. Egelston on the Joint Faculty Policy Committee for the first semester of the 1967-1968 school year.

Memorandum from Dean Bond - Committee for Selection of the Dean of the College of Business

Mr. Shuman read the following communication from Dean Bond:

This is to inform the Council with regard to the make-up of the Committee for the Selection of the Dean of the College of Business.

The Chairman will be Dr. Thomas Comfort, who was selected from the nominees presented to me by the University Council.

The Secretary of the Committee, who is named by me from among persons holding administrative appointments, will be Dr. Theodore Sands.

The three persons elected by the College of Business are Dr. Raymond Esworthy, Dr. James Hallam, and Dr. Arnold Condon.

It is assumed the Committee will begin working at once in hopes of completing the selection process as quickly as possible. I have instructed the Committee, however, that our desire is to get the best possible Dean for this embryonic college, and this desire overbalances the desire for speed.

Memorandum from Dean Bond - Recreation Problem

Mr. Shuman read a communication from Dean Bond in which he pointed out the concentration of people in the area of Normal and the extremely imposed limitation on land acquisition. He recommended that the University Council establish a group on campus which would study the problem of providing planned recreational facilities and programs for both students and faculty and in the future would maintain contact with the Council, the Committee on Future Development, the Physical Education Departments, the Dean of Students Office and the Dean of the Faculty's Office.

Mr. Hicklin moved that the Executive Committee appoint an appropriate ad hoc committee to study the problem. Mr. Hage seconded the motion. The motion carried by a voice vote.

Meeting of University Council on August 9, 1967

Mr. Kohn moved that the next regular meeting of the University Council be held on August 9 instead of August 16. Mr. Peterson seconded the motion. The motion carried by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Ferrell moved that the meeting be adjourned. Miss Speer seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley Shuman, chairman

Mary Rozum, secretary

SS/MR:kb

TO: Dr. Stanley Shuman, Chairman
University Council
Illinois State University

FROM: Henry J. Hermanowicz, Chairman
University Curriculum Committee

DATE: July 10, 1967

The University Curriculum Committee in official action taken in its meeting of June 1 approved the proposed revision of general education presented before the Committee of 58 by the Subcommittee on General Education. The action of the University Curriculum Committee involved one dissenting vote in this approval of the proposed general education program. However, the University Curriculum Committee has, to my knowledge, always operated by employing thoughtful consideration of the different opinions and points of view presented during its deliberations. Therefore, it is important that the members of the University Council also recognize the counter-arguments and minority opinion expressed prior to the University Curriculum Committee action taken in its meeting of June 1.

Attached is a set of objections offered by Bernard McCarney to the proposed revision of general education and his alternative proposal. I would appreciate your distributing a copy of this letter and Bernard's comments to each member of the University Council.

HJH:gt

TO: Dr. Stanley Shuman, Chairman
University Council
Illinois State University

FROM: The Subcommittee on General Education

Francis B. Belshe
Benjamin J. Keeley
Bernard L. Ryder
Stanley B. Shuman
Henry J. Hermanowicz, Chairman

DATE: July 10, 1967

CC: Members, Council on General Education
Members, University Curriculum Committee

The University Curriculum Committee has requested that the Proposal on General Education, which has been developed by its Subcommittee, be placed on the agenda of the University Council meeting scheduled for July 19. At that meeting of the University Council, its Subcommittee will be prepared to present its proposal and answer questions concerning its

details. Please distribute copies of this report to all members of the University Council.

STEPS TAKEN BY SUBCOMMITTEE

Perhaps it would be wise here to review briefly the steps taken by the Subcommittee since its inception in the spring of 1963:

1. The Subcommittee formulated a five-page questionnaire designed to obtain faculty opinion on the present general education program and areas for possible improvement.
2. The questionnaire along with a summary of the present general education program was sent to each member of the faculty (550) in September, 1963.
3. 164 questionnaires (about 30%) were returned to the Subcommittee by faculty representatives.
4. The Subcommittee formulated a seven-page summary of faculty responses to the questionnaire and sent this summary to all faculty members.
5. Eight major problem areas relevant to the university's general education program were identified as a result of faculty response:
 - A. Use of proficiency tests to satisfy general education requirements
 - B. The role and place of elective courses in general education
 - C. The place of foreign languages in general education
 - D. Electives in Group V category of the present general education program
 - E. The establishment of general education requirements in academic philosophy
 - F. The establishment of mathematics and/or logic requirements in general education
 - G. The most appropriate grouping of courses in the humanities
 - H. The relations of total university requirements: general education, specialization, and professional education.
6. On April 15 and May 13, 1964, respectively, open faculty meetings on the first two of the above problem areas were held.
7. The Subcommittee studied literature dealing with liberal and/or general education in order to clarify the nature of general education.
8. General education programs of representative colleges and universities were examined by the Subcommittee.
9. The Subcommittee formulated a set of proposals to revise the general education program at Illinois State University. The proposed tentative general education revisions were designed as a modest rather than large-scale modification of the present program.
10. The proposed revisions were discussed in three meetings of the Curriculum Committee (spring, 1966).
11. The proposed revisions along with the history of the Subcommittee efforts leading to the proposed revisions were presented before the ISU Chapter of AAUP (October 11, 1966).
12. The Subcommittee submitted a plan for faculty communication and involvement with respect to proposed revisions in general education for approval by the University Curriculum Committee. With only a minor addition, the plans were approved in the meeting of the University Curriculum Committee on October 17, 1966.
13. The plan identified in item 12 above was approved by the University Council on November 16, 1966. This plan and its dates of execution were as follows:
 - A. Permission was requested and granted from the University Council to report the Subcommittee recommendations to:
 - (1) A meeting of all department heads and acting deans with time available for questions and discussion, conducted on January 3.
 - (2) A meeting of the general faculty following the department heads and deans meeting, which was conducted on January 17.
 - (a) This meeting was one of largely reporting the recommendations and procedures employed.

- (b) Each faculty member received a written copy of the recommendations shortly after the general faculty meeting (January 18). A sheet was attached to the recommendations whereby each faculty member was urged to send to the Subcommittee his objections or suggestions relevant to the proposed program. The Subcommittee received a 17% return which was summarized to the Committee of 58.
 - (c) It was requested that the recommendations be discussed in each of the 29 departments of the university.
 - (d) Each department elected one representative and along with the department head, the two served on a committee to discuss the general education proposal with the Subcommittee (the Committee of 58). The Director of Admissions, the Dean of the Faculty, and the Dean of Students, as well as the Acting Deans of the Colleges, members of the University Curriculum Committee, and members of the newly established Council on General Education.
- B. The Committee of 58 served in an advisory capacity to the Subcommittee on General Education. Three meetings were held between the Committee of 58 and the Subcommittee on General Education (May 13, May 20, and May 31). At the conclusions of the three meetings, a final set of recommendations regarding general education was presented to the University Curriculum Committee and approved on June 1. The University Curriculum Committee later instructed the Subcommittee by a motion to present the proposed revised program of general education to the University Council at its July meeting.

The foregoing outline brings the activities of the Subcommittee up to date with the following proposed revision of general education at Illinois State University hereby submitted to the University Council:

GENERAL EDUCATION

A minimum of 52 hours is required of all students seeking any undergraduate degree.

1. Every 100 level course offered to satisfy general education requirements should have a proficiency examination designed and offered as an alternative means of satisfying requirements for the course and general education.
2. The maximum number of hours students may earn toward satisfying general education requirements by satisfactorily passing proficiency examinations should be increased from 16 to 32.
3. The five general education groups and the subject area requirements within each group should be revised accordingly:

GROUP I. COMMUNICATIONS

Language - Composition (3)

Speech (3)

6 Semester Hours

GROUP II. SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

12 Semester Hours

Twelve semester hours of credit must be earned in at least three of the five following areas:

Anthropology, Psychology, Political Science, Sociology, Economics

GROUP III. HUMANITIES

13 Semester Hours

A. Literature and Foreign Languages (3 to 9)

(A minimum of 3 semester hours is required in literature.)

B. Fine Arts (2 to 5)

(No more than 3 semester hours may be taken in any one of the three areas.)

Art, Drama, Music

C. History and Philosophy (3 to 9)

(A minimum of 3 semester hours is required in history.)

History, Philosophy

GROUP IV. NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS

12 Semester Hours

Students must earn credit in at least three out of the following five areas with at least one laboratory course:

Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Geography-Geology, Mathematics, Physics

GROUP V. PHYSICAL EDUCATION

3 Semester Hours

GROUP VI. ELECTIVES

6 Semester Hours

A student may elect six semester hours of study in any field or fields outside of his major or minor area of study.

CONCERNS OF SUBCOMMITTEE

There are two additional concerns that the members of the Subcommittee wish to call to the attention of the University Council members:

1. The members of the Subcommittee on General Education agreed, after the final meeting with the Committee of 58, that it would be desirable to modify the parenthetical insert of Group III, C, so that it would read as follows:
"(A minimum of 3 semester hours is required in non-U. S. History.)"

It was felt that since most students had previous exposure to U. S. History, general education at the collegiate level in history would best be satisfied by a stipulation requiring non-U. S. History.

However, members of the University Curriculum Committee, while generally sympathetic to the proposal, would not approve its insertion because it represented a modification of the final proposal submitted to the Committee of 58 under procedures approved by the University Council.

2. In the proposed revised program of general education, it would be impossible for a student to elect a maximum number of hours (9) in either category "A" or "C" of Group III while still electing only the minimum number of hours in the two remaining categories and earn only 13 semester hours of credit. The student would have to earn 14 semester hours of credit in the humanities under such circumstances. Of course, the one-hour overload could be transferred as credit toward Group VI Electives. However, perhaps a better way of handling the possibility of such a numerical discrepancy would simply be to change the required hours in Group III to 14 while reducing those in Group VI to 5. This matter was also called to the attention of the members of the University Curriculum Committee but they decided not to consider any changes here for the same reason cited with respect to the parenthetical modification of the history requirement.

OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM AND SUGGESTIONS FOR REVISION

The proposed general education program approved by the University Curriculum Committee on June 1, 1967 contains several revisions which, if adopted by the University Council, would weaken the general education program at Illinois State University.

The Sub-committee on General Education, after many months of study and deliberation, had submitted a proposed general education program which was accompanied by a strong, well-reasoned rationale for both the deletion of Group V of the present program and the inclusion of Philosophy as a general education requirement. The Philosophy requirement would principally have been met by deleting Group V, the elective, or Hygiene, 2 hours, and reducing the Physical Education requirement by 1 (one) hour.

The sub-committee stated, "(we) saw no inherent value in unrestricted elective courses in general education,"* and also stated, as the first point in a summary, the recommended program, ". . . Eliminates a problem area involving electives which often are not an integral part of general education."

Subsequent revision, following the meetings of the Committee of 58, have not only deleted Philosophy as a requirement, but have created Group VI, a completely unrestricted category for the meeting of general education requirements.

The inclusion of Group VI, runs completely counter to the original rationale for the deletion of Group V from the existing program. The ostensible purpose for the inclusion of Group VI was the need for "flexibility" in the general education program. This "need" for flexibility emanates most strongly from departments which have inordinately large numbers of hours required in their major or have very large cognate field requirements outside of the major. The real purpose, then, of the need for flexibility via electives is the meeting of requirements for the area of specialization. Thus Group VI, rather than providing for flexibility, is a means for many departments of reducing substantive general education requirements to 46 semester hours.

The Sub-committee had also noted that the recommended program, ". . . Strengthens the breadth of student exposure to the diversified areas of knowledge comprising the arts and sciences." The use of Group VI, in conjunction with any of the several fields in Groups II, III, or IV creates the possibility of avoiding any "broadly-based" general education. The subsequent revision thus contributes to a substantial narrowing of the general education program.

This criticism may also be directed to Groups I and II. The suggestion has been made that courses other than the basic composition course and the basic speech course satisfy the requirement for Group I. If entering students are able to demonstrate the attainment of a minimal level of competence in the communications area, as well as any other area, the basic rationale for the requirements in that Group is considerably weakened.

In Group II, the unlinking of Sociology and Anthropology in an attempt to achieve greater flexibility has possibly created a grouping which will permit a greater proportion of students to avoid a basic course in economics. I had hoped that someone other than an Economist would have entered this particular objection to the general proposal. I personally am not interested in playing the enrollment numbers game, but, having entered a field which has a crucial

*"Background for Considering Proposed Revisions in the General Education Program," p. 10.

relevance for the effective, intelligent functioning of a democratic society, I felt compelled to note this weakness in the approved proposal.

SUGGESTIONS FOR REVISION

Since Group VI was created by deleting 6 semester hours from Group III (Humanities) I would suggest the complete restoration of the 6 semester hours to the Group, and the addition of 3 semester hours to the minimum of III(c).

Group III would then read:

<u>Group III. HUMANITIES</u>		<u>19 semester hours</u>
A. Literature and Foreign Languages (3 to 9)		
(A minimum of 3 semester hours is required in Literature.)		
Foreign Language	Literature	
B. Fine Arts (2 to 5)		
(No more than 3 semester hours may be taken in any one of the three areas.)		
Art	Drama	Music
C. History and Philosophy (6 to 9)		
(A minimum of 3 semester hours is required in history.)		
History		Philosophy

This revision would restore the possibility of Philosophy becoming a significant part of the general education program.

Group II would be revised as follows:

<u>Group II. SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES</u>		<u>12 semester hours</u>
Twelve semester hours of credit must be earned in at least 3 of the 4 following areas:		
Anthropology-Sociology	Political Science	
Psychology	Economics	

These suggestions obviously present problems for those Departments which have either the large semester hour requirements or large cognate field requirements which cannot simultaneously meet general education requirements. This is, however, the problem of those departments and not of the general education program. Consequently, it would appear most wise to direct departments to examine carefully their requirements in an effort to conform with a general education program, and not allow the general education program to be shaped by the specific requirements of a few departments.

B. J. McCarney
University Curriculum Committee

TO: University Council

July 7, 1967

FROM: Academic Standards Committee

RE: Revision of requirements for University Scholastic Honors

I. Objective of the Request is to insure that:

- A. The group honored on Scholastic Honors Day really include all the top students scholastically.
- B. Selection be made increasingly by IBM computation.

II. Present Statement (Catalog 1966-67 Issue Page 36)

"University Scholastic Honors

Each spring at Scholastic Honors Day Convocation, Illinois State University honors the three percent of the undergraduate student body having the highest grade-point average. These students must have earned at least 12 semester hours during each of the two preceding semesters. Freshman honors, however, are based on their work during the first semester. Sophomore, junior, and senior honors are based on the two preceding semesters and the intervening summer sessions, if the student attended during the summer."

III. Proposed Revision - to replace the above paragraph

University Scholastic Honors

Each spring at Scholastic Honors Day Convocation, Illinois State University honors the three percent of the undergraduate student body having the highest cumulative grade point average in all course work at Illinois State University. Freshmen and transfer students are eligible if they have earned at least 12 semester hours at Illinois State University.

IV. Elaboration of Objectives underlying the request

- A. The committee feels that the University should honor students who can sustain a high scholastic level. The Dean's List at present honors students who achieve a high one semester scholastic average. As presently structured, Scholastic Honors Day further recognizes students who are in the upper 3% on two semesters work, while some students in the upper 3% on all academic work may not be honored. For example, this year a senior graduating with highest honors (GPA 3.89) was not included in Honors Day because she spent her junior year at a foreign university, and so was not eligible under the present requirements.
- B. The proposed change would make it possible to use the IBM cumulative GPA. The upper 3% cut off point can be determined by IBM. The only further screening would be an inspection of the full transcript to make sure that students had at least 12 semester hours at Illinois State University. With the university growth in enrollment, the present requirement already has become prohibitive of Records Office time. The problem will become progressively worse.

Ellen Kelly, Chairman, Richard Bond, Robert Duty, Dorathy Eckelmann, Esther Kirchhoefer, Paul Mattingly, Herbert Turrentine